

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/695,867

Applicant(s)

KONISHI, MASAHIRO

Examiner

Lana Le

Art Unit

2685

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Edward F. Urban.(3) Lana Le.(2) Mr. Phillip Miller.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 September 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conferencec) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.Identification of prior art discussed: Schwartz, Sashihara.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was discussed to include the features of displaying a menu for transmitting/receiving the data and determining the size of the memory in determining to transfer the data to the apparatus. It appears that such a memory determining feature is not shown by the applied references.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required